

**SECTION 95 NOTIFICATION REPORT AND NOTIFICATION DECISION FOR
LANDUSE CONSENT APPLICATION LUC21/47890**

Applicant:	REGINA PROPERTIES LIMITED
Applicant's address for service:	390 Devon Street East NEW PLYMOUTH 4312
Site Address:	1 – 3 Dawson Street, New Plymouth
Legal Description:	LOT 1 DP 19148, Lot 2 DP 19418 and Lot 1 DP 10510
Site Area:	1553 m ²
<u>Zone and Overlays:</u>	
Operative District Plan:	Business B
Proposed District Plan:	Mixed Use Zone
Operative District Plan Overlays:	Cameron Street View Shaft Section 2 and Pūkākā/Marsland Hill Viewshaft
Proposed District Plan Overlays	Coastal Environment, Coastal Erosion Hazard Area, Notable Tree Group (ID 357) , Cameron Street View Shaft Section 2 and Pūkākā/Marsland Hill Viewshaft
Proposal:	Land use consent for alterations and extensions to an existing commercial building to establish a new residential rooftop apartment.
Status:	The proposal is a restricted discretionary activity under the following rules of the New Plymouth District Plan: Bus13, Bus19, Bus87, Bus88, OL63 and OL71 under the Operative District Plan.
Date consent application received:	12/02/2021
Further information requested/report commissioned:	15/03/2021
Further information/report received:	29/03/2021

PURPOSE OF THIS REPORT

1. The purpose of this notification report is for the Council to decide whether or not the public or specific parties should be notified of a proposal requiring resource consent to give them an opportunity to have their say on the proposal. This report is not to consider whether or not resource consent should be granted; that will be a matter for a subsequent report.

SITE DESCRIPTION AND SURROUNDING ENVIRONMENT

2. The site includes three records of title under the following lot descriptions.

- Lot 1 DP 19148;
- Lot 2 DP 19418; and
- Lot 1 DP 10510

The sum of the three allotments account for approximately 1553m² of land. Lots 1 DP 19148 and Lot 1 DP10510 consists of the majority of the site and all of the development works. Lot 2 DP 19148 is a narrow strip of land owned by the New Plymouth District Council (NPDC) which the existing commercial building extends into. The narrow strip of land owned by NPDC currently accommodates landscape planting, the existing building encroaches over this. Each lot is held under a separate certificate of title.

3. To the west the site adjoins Dawson Street, to the north the coastal walkway (Regina Place), to the east the site adjoins a site which accommodates three residential apartments and the remaining adjoin boundary adjoins a property owned by the applicant which are currently vacant commercial properties. Across of Dawson Street are residential properties, similarly across of St Aubyn Street to the south are the Davenport Apartments and to east Richmond Estate.
4. The nearby road network includes the adjoin Dawson Street which then becomes Hine Street as it turns the corner. Both Dawson Street and Hine Street are classified as Local Roads under the Operative District Plan. Both have a 50 kph speed limit and an average daily traffic count of 720 (2016 data). Further to the south, but not adjoin and separated by a currently vacant commercial property is St Aubyn Street, St Aubyn Street is a classified as State Highway (44). Nearby, and at the corner of Hine Street and Dawson Street is the "Honey field Fountain" the Honey field Fountain is identified within both the ODP and PDP as a heritage item. In addition to the Honey field Fountain the site a protected group of Pohutakawa trees lay immediately north f the site and are identified as Notable Tree Group 357 in the ODP and PDP. Across of the public coastal walkway is the Marton-New Plymouth Railway Line.
5. The site is illustrated in red on Figure 1 below.



Figure 1: Location Plan

PROPOSAL

6. The applicant proposes to undertake substantial additions and extensions to the existing commercial building at the site described above. The works will provide for a single residential apartment with an annexed three and four story construction. Part of the fourth story will be that atop of the existing 3 story building at the site. The main elements of the proposal are summarised below.
 - Additions to the existing building resulting in a three storied annex addition to the existing building as a southern extension;
 - In addition to the three story annex extension the third story of this extension will extend over the existing three story Govett Quilliam building resulting in a fourth story to that structure, this is due to the existing step down/drop from Lot 1 DP 10510 to Lot 1 DP 19148;
 - The fourth/third storey respectively provides for a rooftop apartment including both indoor and outdoor areas and an outdoor pool;
 - The existing commercial tenancy will be retained ground, first and second floors;

- Car parking for the existing commercial facility would be reduced from 13 to 11 car parks including one accessible park, an e charging park and bike parking area.
 - A separate two car garage will be provided for the house.
 - Existing vegetation will be retained where possible including the landscaping within Lot 2 DP 10510 and the large palm tree located at the north-eastern corner of the site;
 - Landscape planting;
 - Building finishes;
7. The proposed use of the building extensions/additions is described below on a floor by floor basis. The building layouts are also illustrated in the plans provided by the applicant. The following descriptions only relate to the proposed residential additions as the commercial tenancy is to remain unchanged with exception to some minor operational matters, such as parking and also likely cosmetic refits and refurbishments.

Ground Floor

- Two bay internal garage accessed from Dawson Street
- Pedestrian access corridor to main entry/foyer
- Gym, single bedroom with ensuite and storage
- Courtyard adjoining eastern boundary.

First Floor

- Stairwell and lift access with two bedrooms, one bathroom, a lounge and eastern and western balconies.

Second Floor

- The remainder of the apartment building including the main living spaces being two separate lounges, kitchen, dining area, master bedroom with ensuite and wardrobes, additional bedroom, an office/library, eastern and western balconies and then an extensive outdoor deck area toward the north including a pool and outdoor seating.
8. The proposal replaces a previous but similar proposal made by the applicant which withdrawn following notification. Comparison is made to the previous proposal within the applicants AEE and plans, however the proposal is entirely separate to the previous consent application. The proposal would also supersede a historical resource consent for the site granted in 1996 to construct the office building including balconies overhanging a designated recreation reserve / landscape strip and the provision of 13 car parks.
9. The proposal will not impact on the existing airspace encroachment, changes to the existing building will largely be limited to updating external cladding and painting.

10. No earthworks are proposed outside of the existing building curtilage.
11. Figure 2 below is the Dawson Street Elevation, a full set of plans, including shading diagrams, elevations and floor layouts are provided with the application made to Council by the applicant's agent BTW Company Limited.



Figure 2: Dawson Street Elevation

STATUTORY REASONS FOR THE APPLICATION & ACTIVITY STATUS

1. The New Plymouth District Plan (District Plan) became operative on 15 August 2005. The subject site is within the Business B Environment Area and is subject to the Coastal Environment, Coastal Erosion Hazard Area, Notable Tree Group (ID 357), Cameron Street View Shaft Section 2 and Pūkākā/Marsland Hill Viewshaft overlay(s). Dawson Road is classified as a Local Road.
2. The proposal does not comply with the following District Plan rule(s):

Rule Bus 13 – specifies a 10m maximum height limit for the location. The proposal cannot meet the permitted conditions of this rule because the building height is a maximum of 15.4m. This is a **restricted discretionary** activity.

Rule Bus 19 – specifies that seven landscaping trees would be required along the Regina Place road boundary, two are proposed. This is a **restricted discretionary** activity.

Rule Bus 87 – specifies the quantity and design standards for car parks to be provided. The proposal would require 16 parks to meet the standards set under Bus 87, 13 are proposed. This is a **restricted discretionary** activity.

Rule Bus 88 – specifies the loading and standing space requirements. No designated loading or standing space has been proposed by the applicant. This is a **restricted discretionary** activity.

Rule OL 63 – Maximum height of a building within the Cameron Street viewshaft specifies a 10m maximum height. The proposal cannot meet the permitted conditions of this rule because the building height is a maximum of 15.4m. This is a **restricted discretionary** activity.

Rule OL 71 – Maximum height of a building within the Cameron Street viewshaft specifies a 10m maximum height. The proposal cannot meet the permitted conditions of this rule because the building height is a maximum of 15.4m. This is a **restricted discretionary** activity.

Activity Status

3. The proposal is therefore a **restricted discretionary activity**.
4. There are no provisions within the PDP relevant to the application with immediate legal affect and therefore further assessment under the PDP is not necessary.

ADEQUACY OF THE APPLICATION

5. The applicant has provided an assessment of effects of the activity on the environment (AEE). The AEE provided is supported by technical reports including the following:
 - Landscape Visual Impact Assessment;
 - Visual Simulations; and
 - Shading Effects Diagrams
6. Through the Section 92 process further more detailed plans and descriptions against those plans with respects to shading effects was requested. In addition the further shading assessments additional information regarding building, design, finish and particularly landscape mitigation was requested.
12. I have assessed the application under Section 88 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and have determined that the application is complete. It is noted that subsequent information was requested by Council under Section 92 and a response has now been satisfactorily supplied by the applicant in full.
13. Overall the application in conjunction with the additional information supplied by the applicant contains sufficient information to allow for an assessment of effects as required for notification.

REQUIREMENT FOR OTHER CONSENTS

14. It has been determined that no further resource consents under the RMA are necessary for the proposal.

National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil 2011 (NES_{soil})

15. Regulations 5(4)(5)&(6) of the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health) Regulations 2011 (NESC) describes subdivision, change of land use and disturbing soil as activities to which the NES applies. However, only where an activity that can be found on the Ministry for the Environment's Hazardous Activities and Industries List (HAIL) has or is likely to have occurred on the site.
16. The property has been used for commercial purposes based on historical aerial imagery and information provided by the applicant. An assessment of the HAIL list has been carried out along with a site visit and the information provided by the applicant within the AEE. Based on the information I do not consider the site to be a "piece of land" under the requirements of the NES. I have also checked the TRC Selected Land Use register and NPDC's record systems and there are no recorded sites.
17. For the reasons discussed above further assessment against the NES is not required and the site is not considered to be "a piece of land".

NOTIFICATION DECISION

Public Notification (Section 95A)

18. The Council as consent authority must follow the steps set out in the section below, in the order given, to determine whether to publicly notify an application for a resource consent (s95A(1)).

Step 1: Mandatory public notification in certain circumstances

- The applicant has not requested that the application be publicly notified.
- The applicant has not refused to provide further information or refused to agree to commissioning a report under s95C.
- The application is not made jointly with an application to exchange recreation reserve land.

Step 2: If not required by Step 1, public notification precluded in certain circumstances

- The application is not subject to a rule or national environmental standard that precludes notification.

- The Application is not precluded from public notification given it is for a Restricted Discretionary Activity and fails to meet the preclusion tests under Sections 95A(5) and (6) of the Act.

Step 3: If not precluded by step 2, public notification is required in certain circumstances

- The application is not for a resource consent for one or more activities subject to a district plan rule or NES that would require notification.
- The consent authority decides, in accordance with Section 95D that the activity will have or is likely to have adverse effects on the environment that are more than minor.

Effects Disregarded

19. The following effects have been disregarded for the purposes of the notification decision and s104 assessment (s95D, 95E and 104(2)&(3)(a)):
 - The permitted baseline has been applied as the applicant has demonstrated that the site could be developed in such a manner which would provide for a building without the requirement for resource consent. As part of the permitted baseline assessment the effects of a building which can be developed as a permitted activity have been compared with the effects of the effects of the proposed building.
 - Effects on persons who own or occupy the site and adjacent sites who have provided written approval, or are owned by the applicant, have been disregarded for the public notification assessment. These people include the owners of the properties identified in blue on Figure 3 below.
 - Overall, the application is for a Restricted Discretionary Activity and therefore the assessment of adverse effects has been restricted to the matters of which Council have restricted their discretion to as set out under Rules Bus13, Bus19, Bus87, Bus88, OL63 and OL71 of the ODP. The assessment criteria should be read in conjunction with the assessment of effects provided within this report. The relevant assessment criteria is included in Appendix A of this report.
20. The owners of the properties illustrated on Figure 3 below include 2 and 4 Dawson Street, 3 Hine Street and 141 St Aubyn Street have provided their written approval. It is noted that one of the owners of 141 Aubyn Street (Hong Keng Chow) has not provided their written approval and the other owner has not indicated that they have authority to sign on that persons behalf.
21. It is also noted that the following units within the Richmond Estate and Devonport Apartments have also provided written approval but are not illustrated on Figure 3 below as other Richmond Estate and Devonport Apartments residents have not provided their written approval.

- Unit 7A Richmond Estate @ 120 Richmond Street; and
- Unit 2I (Apartment 38) Devonport Apartments @ 127 – 131 St Aubyn Street

22. A list of the properties which the applicant sought to obtain written approval from is included within the AEE document. The table includes the owners of those properties who provided written approval and those which did not.



Figure 3: Written Approvals

Assessment of Effects

23. Council are required to publicly notify an application if it decides that the proposal will have, or is likely to have adverse effects on the environment that are likely to be more than minor. Except for those associated with any Section 95A preclusions or adverse effects to be disregarded as described above at paragraph 19

24. Upon review of the restricted discretionary activities assessment criteria I consider that the following matters and associated adverse effects on the environment are relevant;
- Effects on character including the coastal environment and public walkway.
 - Landscape and visual effects
 - Shading effects on public receptors; and
 - Traffic safety and efficiency

The following assessments considers each of the items identified above and the likely adverse effects on the environment.

Effects on Existing Character – Including the Coastal Environment and Walkway

25. The existing character of the area is largely guided by two main elements. One, the underlying existing and historical zoning of the site and surrounding areas and secondly the sites proximity to the coastal environment and the coastal walkway. Both of which are directly to the north of the site.
26. The eastern side of Dawson Street, of which includes the site, carries a Bus B zoning and has been historically been used in conjunction with commercial uses such as office space. Further to the east the zoning maintains Bus B, however land use is for medium to high density residential living including the Richmond Estate which is accessed from St Aubyn Street. Across Dawson Street to the west land uses are primarily medium density residential, and despite the Bus D zoning. Further to the east along Hine Street the residential land uses continue and is consistent with the Res B zoning.
27. While a mixture between commercial and residential land uses is not common for the surrounding area, the ODP provides for both within the rules framework as a permitted activities. Therefore the mixed use nature of the development would not negatively impact on the existing residential or business characteristics of the area.
28. Similarly to previous assessments made within the now withdrawn design made under LUC20/47660, of which this proposal has a lesser effect on its northern boundary with the Coastal Environment and Walkway, that the proposal will not add any physical obstruction or impact as the proposed works are entirely within the subject site.
29. Visual effects also require consideration. Visual effects, namely those on landscape and visual amenity and shading effects on public areas are considered under the following headings.

Landscape and Visual Effects

30. Landscape and visual effects form a key component of the existing character of the area and therefore requires suitable consideration for the purpose of determining whether public notification is necessary. Particularly given the over height nature of the development, at its highest point the building proposed

exceeds the maximum height thresholds for a permitted activity by 5.3 metres. When compared to the previously proposed building the maximum height infringement was 6.41 metres. I also note that the previous designs over height elements extended closer to the northern boundary compared to what is now proposed. The previous proposal was determined to not require public notification. However, and for completeness an assessment of this proposal's effects is still necessary.

31. The applicants approach to assessing the landscape and visual effects has been to provide a landscape and visual assessment of effects (LVIA) undertaken by Richard Bain of Blue Marble. The LVIA assess effects from various public receptors of which where it has been determined that the effects would be most prevalent. These include both the viewshafts affected, the coastal environment alongside additional locations of interest such as the Honeyfield Fountain and Kawaroa Point. The views are the same as those previously agreed with Council as part of the withdrawn application.
32. The LVIA relies heavily on a number of visual simulations designed to inform the assessment of landscape effects. The conclusions of the LVIA are summarised within the table below. Reference letters are provided and their locations can be viewed in relation to the Location Plans provided in Bluemarble LVIA.

Reference	Location	LVIA Assessment	Peer Review Assessment
A	West from Coastal Walkway	Very Low	Agree
B	Honeyfield fountain	Very Low	Low
C	View from Regina Place	Very Low	Agree
D	View from Kawaroa Park	Very Low	Agree
E	View from Hine Street	Low Beneficial	Agree
F	View from Dawson Street/SH45	Very Low	Very Low to Low
G	View from Kawaroa	Moderate Beneficial	Very Low
N/A	Cameron Street Viewshaft	Negligible	N/A
N/A	Marsland Hill Pukaka Pa Viewshaft	No Change	N/A

Table 1: Public Receptors

33. Overall the Natural Capital Peer Review is generally accepting of the conclusions found within the Blue Marble LVIA, which conclude effects on the public realm will be minor (low) or less than minor (very low). There are also components which can be viewed as having a positive impact given the modern proposals ability to improve built form.

34. Based on the assessments made by Bluemarble and Natural Capital's peer review, I conclude that the landscape and visual effects on the wider environment including the coastal environment and coastal walkway would be minor and would not reach the threshold required for the application to be publically notified.

Shading (Public Receptors)

35. As illustrated within the shading diagrams provided with the AEE and Section 92 response it is evident that the proposal will increase shading onto the adjoining Dawson Street and Hine Street. However, and when compared to the permitted baseline, the additional shading on these public areas of road reserve would be at level considered to be minor or less than minor.
36. Other public receptors of interest include the Coastal Walkway and the Honeyfield Fountain which is a heritage item. The location of the building is toward the south of these receptors and therefore any additional shading effects would be negligible. This is also consistent with the shading diagrams presented by the applicant.

Traffic Safety and Efficiency

37. Under the ODP, and as stated previously, the activity, of which includes the commercial tenancy, would require approximately 16 parks. The proposed layout would provide for 11 parks for the commercial tenancy and suitably sized bike cage. A further two parks are provided for the residential apartment resulting in a total of 13 parks. Section 4.8 of the BTW AEE provides an assessment of the possible traffic effects. Overall it is described that the shortfall of 3 parks can be easily accommodated within the neighboring streets.
38. Council's Network Lead John Eagles reviewed the earlier proposal, which had an identical parking arrangement, as well as the updated proposal and has advised that the surrounding network will be able to absorb any periodic overspill without there being any significant adverse effects on road function or safety. Overall any such effects are therefore considered to be at a minor level.

Step 4: Public Notification in special circumstances

39. The location is adjacent to the coastal walkway of which may generate some wider public interest. However, and largely for the reasons discussed above, I am of the opinion that the proposal does not constitute an exceptional matter which would the threshold of being considered as a special circumstance.

Step 4: Public Notification in special circumstances

40. It is concluded under Section 95A of the RMA that the application does not need to be publicly notified.

Limited Notification (Section 95A)

Step: certain affected groups and affected persons must be notified

- No protected customary rights groups or customary marine title groups are affected by the activity.
- The proposal is not on land that contains a Statutory Acknowledgement Area.

Step 2: If not required by Step 1, limited notification precluded in certain circumstances

- The application is not subject to a rule or national environmental standard that precludes notification.
- The application is not precluded from limited notification as it fails to meet the preclusion tests under Section 95B

Step 3: If not precluded by Step 2, certain other affected persons must be notified

- A person is affected if the consent authority decides that the activity's adverse effects on the person are minor or more than minor.

Assessment of Affected Persons

41. It is considered that the actual and likely adverse effects on neighboring persons are limited to landscape / visual effects, Shading effects, parking effects, traffic effects and construction effects. Each is therefore assessed under the following sub-headings.

Landscape and Visual Effects

42. Both Bluemarble and Natural Capital have assessed the likely landscape and visual effects. Earlier sections to this report considered public viewpoints, however it is noted that there is also the potential for there to be effects on persons who have not provided written approval on their existing landscape views. The process undertaken by Bluemarble, Natural Capital and Campbell Robinson (planning officer) in association with the previous consent largely determined the persons likely to be effected at minor or more than minor levels and therefor requiring notification. However for completeness the following table is provided, properties who have provided written have been excluded from the table below. A "low" magnitude of effect equates to minor for the purposes of the analysis required under Section 95A of the RMA.

Reference	Address	LVIA Assessment	Peer Review Assessment
A	8 Hine Street	Very Low	Agree
D	100, 120 St Aubyn Street	Very Low	Agree – however consideration to roof finishes appropriate.
E	131 St Aubyn Street	Low Beneficial	Generally Agree – though uncertainty around how

			viewable the roof would be from the 3 rd floor of the Davenport apartments.
F	16 Dawson Street	Very Low	Agree
H	8 Dawson Street	Negligible	Agree
I	131 St Aubyn Street	Negligible	Further Detail required to exclude from notification.
J	16 Hine Street	Very Low	Agree

Table 2: Landscape Effects Private Properties

43. It is difficult to accurately determine the likely effects on residents of the Davenport Apartments or Richmond Estate. As the applicant hasn't provided a specific assessment against each apartment, and due to difficulties in being able to view the site from each apartment it is considered to be appropriate to take a cautious approach towards limited notification.
44. It is anticipated that all of the north facing apartments of the top two floors of the Devonport apartments are considered likely to be affected to an extent. As such notification will be served on all of these properties. Of which reflects the previous notification decision associated with LUC20/47660.
45. A similar approach is taken with respects to the Richmond Estate and I consider that the top 5 floors are likely to be affected to some extent which is possible to be minor or more than minor. The properties are likely to notice the proposed rooftop apartment and considerations as to finishes and or any final landscape mitigation may determine the overall effects. It is considered that the lower levels of both buildings described above are unlikely to experience any views of the proposed rooftop apartment. However shading effects on lower properties within the Richmond Estate are possible and are considered within the following section of this report.

Shading Effects – Private Receptors

46. Information supplied with the application made to Council and a subsequent Section 92 response assess the potential shading impacts of the proposal. The information provided compares shading of the proposal against the existing building and the permitted baseline. The information supplied includes 2d diagrams as well as 3d diagrams in conjunction with a written description detailing the likely level of effects and times of day.
47. Overall, based on the information provided within the application, Section 92 response and as assessed by Natural Capital, I consider that properties within the Richmond Estate and Oceanview Apartments will be adversely affected by shading. As such properties which have not provided their written approval will require notification on a limited basis. The properties most greatly affected are those at 122 St Aubyn Street identified in Figure 4 below. At a lesser level, but still potentially at a minor level of effect, are the Richmond Estate lower level terraced apartments, of who will also require notification to be served on. Further there are shared spaces and therefore all lower level units associated with the terraced

housing and the units within the main tower have been notified as well as the body corporate due to the potential effects on common areas.



Parking and Traffic Effects

48. As the proposed commercial and residential development would not meet the ODP requirement of 16 parks. Therefore overflow effects and the impact on surrounding persons requires consideration.
49. It has been identified that a majority of the surrounding dwellings have provision for two off street parks within garages and/or driveways. As such periodic overspill of parking, which would not impact private resident's ability to park their own vehicles within reasonable proximity to their dwelling. Parking effects are therefore considered to be less than minor in nature.

Construction Effects

50. It is expected that there will be some small scale site preparation required, however demolition will be limited as the existing commercial building on site is largely being retained and added to rather than demolished. All of the works required are to be located within the boundaries of the site. The site will be serviced by trade vehicles and site deliveries, however it is considered that there is sufficient space on site to allow for construction and delivery vehicles to undertake their work without spilling on to the road.

51. Construction activities will be limited to a small amount of earthworks of which consent would not be required for. Further construction noise standards will be required to be met by the applicant throughout the duration of the works. Therefore, and given the modest scale, temporary and localized nature of the construction works any associated adverse effects are considered to be a less than minor levels.

Step 4: Further notification in special circumstances

52. I consider that no special circumstances exist that warrant the application being limited notified under Section 95B(10).

Conclusion on limited notification

53. In summary and as indicated within the above assessment of landscape and visual character and shading effects sections, it has been determined that the application is to be processed on a limited-notified basis in accordance with Section 95B of the Resource Management Act 1991. The Limited notification is required because of the actual; and potential adverse landscape, visual and shading effects of the proposed development.
54. The parties to be included within the limited notification are summarised in Table 3 below. It is difficult to unequivocally determine what effects might result from the proposal on a number of properties due to access issues, as such the extent of notification applied has been cautious by capturing a number of possibly affected properties. The limited notification is also in line with the applicants identification of potentially affected parties through their list of written approvals sought.
55. The notification period will begin on 14 April 2021 and conclude no later than 5pm 12 May 2021. **20 working days excludes ANZAC Day.**

#	Legal Description	Physical Address	Property Owner
1	Unit 6A – Lot 2 DP 6788	120 St Aubyn Street (Richmond Estate)	WH and KJ Gardiner, LW Nominees Ltd
2	Unit 5A – Lot 2 DP 6788	120 St Aubyn Street (Richmond Estate)	BR and JA O'Byrne
3	Unit 4A – Lot 2 DP 6788	120 St Aubyn Street (Richmond Estate)	LM Sharrock, CB Wilkinson, GR and PM Sarten
4	Unit 3A – Lot 2 DP 6788	120 St Aubyn Street (Richmond Estate)	EA Pease
5	Unit GA – Lot 2 DP 6788	120 St Aubyn Street (Richmond Estate)	DVJ Trustees Limited
6	Unit GB – Lot 2 DP 6788	120 St Aubyn Street (Richmond Estate)	Trevor Clegg, Kay Clegg
7	Unit GC - Lot 2 DP 6788	Richmond Estate being 120 St Aubyn Street	Sr Taranaki Trustees Lim, Kaylene Stewart, Larry Stewart

8	Unit 1A – Lot 2 DP 6788	120 St Aubyn Street (Richmond Estate)	Paul Carrington, Hendrika Hey, Morris Hey
9	Unit 1B – Lot 2 DP 6788	120 St Aubyn Street (Richmond Estate)	William Hurlstone, Judith Hurlstone
10	Unit 2A – Lot 2 DP 6788	120 St Aubyn Street (Richmond Estate)	Kotuku (2012) Limited, Lynette Elizabeth White
11	PU 2C on DP13859 (Apartment 12)	127-131 St Aubyn Street Devonport Apartments	LA White and Kotuku 2012 Limited
12	Unit 2D DP 13859 (Apartment 4)	127-131 St Aubyn Street Devonport Apartments	Bridget Kathleen St George, Hamish Jon Nelson, Bailey Ingham Trustees Limited
13	Unit 2E DP 13859 (Apartment 3)	127-131 St Aubyn Street Devonport Apartments	Gerusio & Silvia Matonse
14	Unit 2F DP 13859 (Apartment 35)	127-131 St Aubyn Street Devonport Apartments	Samantha Billie Pigott
15	Unit 2G DP 13859 (Apartment 36)	127-131 St Aubyn Street Devonport Apartments	Julia Lee Black & CT Legal Trustees
16	Unit 2H DP 13859 (Apartment 37)	127-131 St Aubyn Street Devonport Apartments	PD Jensen & HK Parsons
17	Unit 3C DP 13859 (Apartment 9)	127-131 St Aubyn Street Devonport Apartments	Jason Mark Whakaari & Estelle SHAW
18	Unit 3D DP 13859 (Apartment 2)	127-131 St Aubyn Street Devonport Apartments	Lois Marlene, Scott & Young & Carrington Trustees Ltd
19	Unit 3E DP 13859 (Apartment 1)	127-131 St Aubyn Street Devonport Apartments	BC, EM and SA Holt
20	Unit 3F DP 13859 (Apartment 43)	127-131 St Aubyn Street Devonport Apartments	Sally-Ann Dean
21	Unit 3G DP 13859 (Apartment 44)	127-131 St Aubyn Street Devonport Apartments	Thomas Mark Jason Farley
22	Unit 3H DP 13859 (Apartment 45)	127-131 St Aubyn Street Devonport Apartments	M and K Osborne
23	Unit 3I DP 13859 (Apartment 46)	127-131 St Aubyn Street Devonport Apartments	Matthew Frank Lethbridge
24	Lot 2 DP 521079	122 St Aubyn Street	Diane Elizabeth MacArthur, William John MacArthur
25	Lot 3 DP 521079	122A St Aubyn Street	Colin Michael Comber, Margaret Josephine Comber
26	Lot 4 DP 521079	122B St Aubyn Street	Kay Barbara Lynskey, Timothy Graham Lynskey, NKS Trustees (2018) Limited

27	Lot 1 DP 105 Lot 2 DP 10510 10	3 Dawson Street & 126, 132 St Aubyn Street	Katee Investments Limited
28	Lot 3 DP 377813	4a Dawson Street	Mr Louis Stephen KURIGER, Mrs Barbara Joan KURIGER, KURIGER TRUSTEES LIMITED
29	Lots 3-6 DP 2533	6, 6A, 8, 8A Dawson Street and 144-150 St Aubyn Street	Housing New Zealand Limited
30	Lot 2 DP 6436	3A Hine Street	Rosalie Bennett
31	Lot 4 DP 4608	8 Hine Street	Anne Fitzgibbons, Harold Paul Fitzgibbons, Gavin Alexander White
33	Body Corporate	120 St Aubyn Street (Richmond Estate)	Chairperson Kaylene Stewart

Table 3: Limited notification

Report and decision by:

Luke Balchin
SENIOR PLANNER

Date: 12 April 2021

Reviewed by:

Richard Watkins
PLANNING COORDINATOR

Date: 12 April 2021